



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,970	07/26/2001	Daniel C. Castle	10005874-1	8587

7590 01/21/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/916,970

**Applicant(s)**

CASTLE, DANIEL C.

**Examiner**

Robert M Stevens

**Art Unit**

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 November 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 11/18/2004 to the original application filed 7/26/2001 by Castle entitled "Advertisement Selection Engine For Placing Micro-Advertising".
2. The Office withdraws the objections to the specification raised in the First Action On the Merits (FAOM), as a result of the amended specification.
3. The Office withdraws the objections to the drawings raised in the First Action On the Merits (FAOM), as a result of the amended specification.
4. The Office maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 112 first paragraph. These rejections have been restated below, in light of (i.e., necessitated by) the amended claims.
5. The FAOM rejections of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 102(e) as being unpatentable over Cottingham, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
6. The FAOM rejections of claims 6-11, 14, 15 and 17-19 under 35 USC 102(e) as being unpatentable over Gupta, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

7. The FAOM rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cottingham in view of Gupta, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
8. The FAOM rejections of claims 12, 13, 16 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Davis, has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
9. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 9, 14 and 17 are independent.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. **Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

**Regarding claim 1**, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused white space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 1 lines 3-4:

**Claims 2-5** are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 6**, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 6 lines 3-4.

**Claims 7-8** are dependent upon claim 6, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 9**, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 9 lines 6-7.

**Claims 10-13** are dependent upon claim 9, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 14**, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 14 lines 7-8.

**Claims 15-16** are dependent upon claim 14, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding claim 17**, Applicant does not provide enabling implementation details explaining how available unused space, which does not interfere with information content, is determined. Reference amended claim 17 lines 4-5.

**Claims 18-20** are dependent upon claim 17, and therefore likewise rejected.

Applicant asserts (see Remarks section on page 8 of Applicant's Amendment submitted 11/18/2004) that paragraphs [0015] – [0020] describing Fig. 2-3 provide enabling support. First, the Office notes that the described passage is found in the publication (US 2003/0023631), and that the originally filed application reference is page 3 line 5 through page 4 line 3. Regarding the independent claim limitations directed to “white space determinations”, this passage and the described Fig. 3 element #310 merely state that a determination is made. Fig. 1 merely shows a pre-insertion web page. Fig. 2 merely depicts a post-insertion web page, i.e., the purported result of Applicant's entire asserted invention.

This “white space determination” limitation is central to Applicant's asserted invention. Common sense dictates that enablement requires an explanation of how Applicant makes such a determination, not merely a statement that such a determination is being made. The Office has not levied a requirement to disclose code. One skilled in the software arts is aware that enablement may be accomplished via any one of several techniques.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-11, 14-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,538, filed Nov. 16, 1998 and issued Nov.

26, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") in view of Bier (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073125, filed Dec. 8, 2000 and published Jun. 13, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Bier").

**Regarding independent claim 1, Gupta discloses:**

*A method for placing a micro-advertisement on a world wide web page comprising information content (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:*  
... ;  
*selecting the micro-advertisement, from a plurality of micro-advertisements, to place on the web page; (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool]) and placing the micro-advertisement on the web page in the available unused space. (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: "insert an advertisement" and empty slot)*

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisement, the available space not interfering with the information content;*

Bier, though, discloses:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisement, the available space not interfering with the information content;*  
([0042] re: discussions on making white space editable and parsing the web page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bier for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would allow a user to divide a web page into editable components, as taught by Bier in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

Art Unit: 2176

**Regarding claim 2**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*the step of transmitting the page to a consumer.* (Abstract, esp. the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence)

**Regarding claim 3**, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*the step of transmitting the page to a consumer over the Internet.*  
(Abstract, esp. the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence)

**Regarding claim 4**, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the step of selecting includes the step of determining the consumer's heuristics.* (Abstract)

**Regarding claim 5**, which is dependent upon claim 2, the limitations of claim 2 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the step of selecting includes the step of determining a value for the micro-advertisement.* (col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)

**Regarding independent claim 6**, Gupta discloses:



Art Unit: 2176

*A method for exposing a consumer to advertisements by placing a plurality of micro-advertisement (col. 11 lines 40-42) on a web page comprising information content (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:*

*... ;*

*determining a value for each of the plurality of micro-advertisements;*  
(col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)

*selecting the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42), from a pool of micro-advertisements, in response to the available space and the value;*  
(col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool]) *and*

*placing the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) on the web page in the available space. (col. 11 lines 21-24)*

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the plurality of micro-advertisements, the available unused space not interfering with the information content;*

Bier, though, discloses:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the plurality of micro-advertisements, the available unused space not interfering with the information content; ([0042] re: discussions on making white space editable and parsing the web page)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bier for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would allow a user to divide a web page into editable components, as taught by Bier in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Claims 7-8** are substantially similar to claims 2-3, respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 9, Gupta discloses:**

*A method for advertising to a consumer over the Internet, from an information service provider, using micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:*

*receiving a request for information content from the consumer; (col. 11 lines 25-26)*

*formatting the information content on the web page; (It is well known in the art that client's browser formats web page in accordance with the HTML instructions found in a web page. See col. 3 lines 24-32 in conjunction with Fig. 5 #512.)*

*... ;*

*selecting the micro-advertisements in response to the available unused space; (col. 12 lines 23-28 re: inserting based upon advertising slot's characteristics and col. 11 lines 36-37 re: determining [i.e., selecting] which advertisement to insert) and*

*placing the micro-advertisements on the web page in the available space. (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: "insert an advertisement" and empty slot)*

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content;*

Bier, though, discloses:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content; ([0042] re: discussions on making white space editable and parsing the web page)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bier for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would allow a user to divide a web page into editable components, as taught by Bier in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Regarding claim 10**, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting the micro-advertisements from a pool of micro-advertisements. (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool])*

**Claim 11** is substantially similar to claim 3, and therefore likewise rejected.

**Regarding independent claim 14**, Gupta discloses:

*A method for advertising to a consumer over the Internet, from an information service provider, using micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content (Abstract), the method comprising the steps of:*

*the information service provider receiving a request for predetermined information content from the consumer; (Fig. 5 #500 and #502)*

*formatting the information content on the web page; (It is well known in the art that client's browser formats web page in accordance with the HTML instructions found in a web page. See col. 3 lines 24-32 in conjunction with Fig. 5 #512.)*

*... ;*

*determining a value for each of the plurality of micro-advertisements; (col. 11 lines 32-38, re: cost for advertisement, and lines 51-65 discussing price negotiation)*

*selecting the micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) in response to the available unused space and the value; (col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool])*

*placing the plurality of micro-advertisements (col. 11 lines 40-42) on the web page in the available unused space; (col. 11 lines 21-24) and transmitting the web page to the consumer. (Fig. 5 #512)*

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content;*

Bier, though, discloses:

*determining available unused space on the web page for the micro-advertisements, the available space not interfering with the information content;*  
([0042] re: discussions on making white space editable and parsing the web page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bier for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would allow a user to divide a web page into editable components, as taught by Bier in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Regarding claim 15**, which is dependent upon claim 14, the limitations of claim 14 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting the micro-advertisements from a pool of micro-advertisements stored on the service provider's Web server.*  
(col. 14 lines 9-16, re: selected advertisement [it being implicit that one selects from a plurality or pool], it being merely a matter of obvious design choice where ads are stored)

**Regarding independent claim 17**, Gupta discloses:

*A system for placing micro-advertisements on a web page comprising information content intended for a consumer (Abstract), the system comprising:*

*a processor (Fig. 2 #213) configured to ... and control processes for automatically placing micro-advertisements within the available unused space in response to micro-advertisement selection criteria;* (col. 11 lines 21-31, re: discussions on inserting an advertisement and empty slot)

*memory (Fig. 2 #215) coupled (Fig. 2 #218) to the processor (Fig. 2 #213), the memory storing the micro-advertisement selection criteria used by the*

Art Unit: 2176

*processor; (Fig. 3 #304, it being a matter of obvious design choice what data one stores in what memory)*

*storage media (Fig. 2 #212) coupled (Fig. 2 #218) to the processor (Fig. 2 #213), the storage media storing the web page of information content, a plurality of micro-advertisements, and a plurality of micro-advertisement selection criteria associated with each micro-advertisement; (Fig. 3 #302 and #304 and descriptions at col. 9 lines 40-60, it being a matter of obvious design choice what data one stores in what memory) and*

*input/output apparatuses (Fig. 2 #219 and #220) coupled (Fig. 2 #218) to the processor (Fig. 2 #213), the input/output apparatuses comprising means for transmitting the page comprising the information content and the micro-advertisement. (Fig. 5 #512)*

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*... determine available unused space on the web page that does not interfere with the information content ...;*

Bier, though, discloses:

*... determine available unused space on the web page that does not interfere with the information content ...;* ([0042] re: discussions on making white space editable and parsing the web page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Bier for the benefit of Gupta, because to do so would allow a user to divide a web page into editable components, as taught by Bier in the Abstract. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Regarding claim 18**, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the storage media comprises means for storing consumer profiles.*  
(Fig. 3 #304, re: "Profile")

**Regarding claim 19**, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the input/output apparatuses comprise an Internet interface that couples the system to the Internet.* (Fig. 2 communications path #219, 218, 220, 221, 222, 224 and 225)

**Regarding claim 20**, which is dependent upon claim 17, the limitations of claim 17 have been previously addressed.

Gupta further discloses:

*wherein the storage media comprises a disk drive for storing the page of information content, the plurality of micro-advertisements, and the plurality of micro-advertisement selection criteria associated with each micro-advertisement.*  
(col. 8 lines 32-35, re: "floppy disks ... computer hard drives")

14. **Claims 12-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent No. 6,487,538, filed Nov. 16, 1998 and issued Nov. 26, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Gupta") in view of Bier (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0073125, filed Dec. 8, 2000 and published Jun. 13, 2002, hereafter referred to as "Bier") and further in view of Laura Lemay (SAM'S Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in 21 Days, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Sam's Publishing, Indianapolis, IN, (c) 2000, pp. 360-361 and 364-365, hereafter referred to as "Lemay").

**Regarding claim 12**, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from various sources.*

Lemay, though, discloses:

*the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from various sources.* (It is well known in the art that web page elements may be aggregated from more than one source. See p. 360, especially paragraph 2 under “Working with Frames” and Fig. 12.7 disclosing a web page having multiple frames, each containing separate content.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lemay for the benefit of Gupta in view of Bier, because to do so would allow one to display a number of separate HTML documents within a single screen as taught by Lemay in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under the p. 360 section “Working with Frames”. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Regarding claim 13**, which is dependent upon claim 9, the limitations of claim 9 have been previously addressed.

However, Gupta does not explicitly disclose:

*the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from the service provider's Web server.*

Lemay, though, discloses:

*the step of the service provider accumulating the information content from the service provider's Web server. (It is well known in the art that web page elements may be aggregated from more than one source. See p. 360, especially paragraph 2 under "Working with Frames" and Fig. 12.7 disclosing a web page having multiple frames, each containing separate content.)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Lemay for the benefit of Gupta in view of Bier, because to do so would allow one to display a number of separate HTML documents within a single screen as taught by Lemay in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph under the p. 360 section "Working with Frames". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., electronic document processing.

**Claim 16** is substantially similar to claim 12, and therefore likewise rejected.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

15. Applicant's arguments filed 11/18/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks on page 8 of the amendment concerning the drawings and specification issues raised in the FAOM have been addressed above (in which the Office withdrew FAOM objections).

In regards to Applicant's remarks on pages 8-9 of the amendment concerning the FAOM 35 USC 101 first paragraph rejections of claims 1-20: As previously stated, the Office maintains the 35 USC 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph issues raised in the FAOM. Determination of "white space or the unused portions found on a web page" is at the core of Applicant's asserted invention. Common sense dictates that enablement requires an explanation of how Applicant makes such a



Art Unit: 2176

determination, not merely a statement that such a determination is being made. The Office has not levied a requirement to disclose code. One skilled in the software arts is aware that enablement may be accomplished via any one of several techniques.

On page 9, Applicant argues for utility. The Office notes that no 35 USC 101 rejection was issued in the FAOM, and thus Applicant's utility arguments are rendered moot.

It is respectfully noted that Applicant's amendment to the independent claims significantly changes the scope of the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments (pages 9-12 of the amendment) concerning FAOM rejections under 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a) have been rendered moot.

### *Conclusion*

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The current fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens  
Art Unit 2176  
Date: January 11, 2005

  
**JOSEPH FEILD**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

rms